

IV. REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-6, 8 and 11-24 are pending in this application. By this amendment, the specification and claims 1, 3, 5-6, 12, 13, 18 and 20 have been amended, claims 2, 7, 9 and 10 have been cancelled, and claims 21-24 have been added. Reconsideration in view of the above amendment and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claim 12 is rejected under U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Eynon (U.S.Pat. 6,524,754), claims 1 and 18 are rejected under U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Miyachi et al. (U.S.Pat. 6,101,237), claims 1-4, 8-9, 18 and 20 are rejected under U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Iwasaki (JP-02001267200A), claims 6, 10 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwasaki (JP-02001267200A) in view of Sakai et al. (U.S.Pat. 4,737,824), and claims 11, 12-15, 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwasaki (JP-02001267200A) in view of Sakai et al. (U.S.Pat. 4,737,824) and further in view of Eynon (U.S.Pat. 6,524,754). Applicants submit that the pending claims are patentable, and the above rejections should be withdrawn.

In particular, with regard to independent claims 1 and 18, Applicants submit that the claimed invention is not anticipated by Iwasaki. Iwasaki does not disclose the claimed invention including a velocity sensor for the pellicle and the feedback of the velocity sensor reading to control pressure.

With regard to independent claim 12, the aerodynamic fairing of the invention has a different physical shape than that of the flexible retainer of Eynon (Fig. 3). The aerodynamic fairing in the invention has a taper and a portion that is co-planar with the pellicle. In contrast, in Eynon, the flexible retainer has an upper protrusion 54 that is above the pellicle 28, which

probably causes drag and turbulence. (Note Col. 3 line 48-56). The aerodynamic fairing of this invention reduces aerodynamic drag and turbulence on the pellicle and, hence, reduces pellicle distortion. In Eynon, the retainer is used to hold the pellicle securely and to ease the removal, cleaning and replacement of the pellicle, and not to reduce aerodynamic drag. (Note Col. 3, lines 48-50 and lines 63-65).

Based on the above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

Applicants have made a number of revisions to the specification to provide antecedent basis for new claims 21-24 in the specification. Applicants submit, however, no new matter has been added because the original disclosure and, in particular, the figures, provides antecedent for this subject matter. The revision to claim 13 has been provided to correct a typographical error.

Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is necessary to place the application in better condition for allowance, he is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Spencer K. Warnick
Reg. No. 40,398

Date:

7/7/03

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
Three E-Comm Square
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)

FAX RECEIVED
JUL 07 2003
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

09/683,748

- 11 -